

**LiLI BOARD**  
**June 6-7, 2000 Meeting**  
**Summary**

**June 6, 2000**

Attendance: Ron Force - University of Idaho, Kay Flowers - Idaho State University, Ann Joslin - Idaho State Library, Rand Simmons - Idaho State Library, Charles Bolles - Idaho State Library, Ruth Funabiki - University of Idaho Law Library, Karen Ganske - Nampa Public Library, John Hannah - Idaho State Library, Frank Nelson - Idaho State Library, Max Leek - Marshall Public Library, Marcia Beckwith - Meridian School District - Joe Reiss - Post Falls, Tom Olson - Boise School District, Tim Brown - Boise State University, Carolyn Mauer - State Department of Education

8:30 a.m. - noon            Committee meetings

1:30-2:45                Discussion: Network Infrastructure and Membership

Joe Reiss and Ruth Funabiki present their ideas regarding the statewide network as a means of beginning the discussion.

Ron Force and Tim Brown proposed that the statewide network is a creature of the State Library.

If the State Library were to operate the network an Advisory Board would still be desirable to recommend services, etc.

Three models, developed by ILNAC, for governance of the statewide network were presented: 1) Centralized in ISL/ISL Board; 2) Distributed/Shared between ISL and ILNAC-type group; 3) Centralized in a separate entity.

It was noted that the Himmel Wilson governance report observed that the people that participated in the focus groups in the library community did not see the statewide network as a separate structure. They saw little need for a new nonprofit organization. Instead, they envisioned funding for the network and its services coming from state general funds, grant funds, and possibly fees. It was also noted that the Network Advisory Board had not endorsed the study.

Tim Brown moved to drop the third model. Seconded by Tom Olsen. Max Leek moved to revise the motion to eliminate both models one and three. Kay Flowers seconded. By consensus, it was agreed that model two was the most desirable for the present time: a distributed/shared network governed by the State Library and the Network Advisory Board.

LiLI is the name of the statewide network and the name of the Network Advisory Board was accordingly changed to the LiLI Board.

It was noted that it was not clear in Himmel & Wilson study whether the LiLI Board was advisory or policy-making. The State Library would like this group to develop policies,

standards, and requirements. The State Library Board only has the authority to set policy. The LiLI Board would recommend policy to the State Library Board.

The State Library Board would delegate authority to the LiLI Board to, e.g., create a networking plan and decide how certain services would be administered.

Membership in the network was discussed. Questions that were discussed included 1) Can a library that doesn't use any of the network services participate in the LiLI Board? 2) Do we assume that every library is a member of the network? 3) Should there be a fee for some services? It was noted that fees might prohibit some public libraries and schools from joining the network. It was decided that there would not be a fee for membership, but there might be a fee for some services. If libraries are eligible to receive current networked services they are members of the network, i.e., there is no membership requirement for the network.

The question of including private libraries in the network was raised but not resolved.

Present services that would be available to all members of the network, without direct cost, include the LiLI databases, the Virtual Catalog (under development), and the LiLI web site. There could be a menu of cafeteria style services (mediated interlibrary loan, courier service, etc.) that libraries could choose to participate in or not. Some of these services would require signed agreements.

The LiLI Board does not contemplate taking any existing services away. If anything they are formalizing what currently exists. If funding for the LiLI databases became stagnant, the board would have to make a choice about going back to the legislature to request funding, etc.

Funding for administration of the network was also discussed. Some of the funding could come from the State Library but it could also be built in to fees. No decision was made regarding this issue.

It was noted that 83-84% of Idaho citizen residents would have access to network services but 17% would not have access because they have no public library. This issue was placed in the bin.

Staffing the network was also discussed. The question of what it would take to fund a ½ time network assistant librarian was raised. State Library staff noted that we already need at least a full time person and by the time we receive legislative funding, we may well need two.

Expansion of networking staff is also restricted by the need to ask the legislature permission to add FTE no matter what the funding source. ISL has less flexibility than academic institutions. We can contract with other organizations for support but the outside organization would be another State entity. The organizational culture of the State Library is set up to conduct business with advisory groups participating in the process.

Rand presented a list of activities and some indication of the level of position that would be necessary to conduct those duties. In this model there would be new positions and there would be some positions that might come from existing units in the State Library.

It was agreed that the network was a network of services.

4:00 – 4:45 Updates & Information Sharing:

**BCR:** Regional library network that brokers databases and OCLC services. The State Library is investigating joining five other western states in buying a statewide membership into BCR. The annual fee is \$5,000 and allows all libraries in state the opportunity to use services with out paying an initiation fee. The State Library is considering the possibility of BCR brokering database purchases including the LiLI databases.

**CIN/VALNet:** There is an LSTA Grant project to investigate cooperative efforts between these two networks. An automation system shared by CIN, VALNet, and INLAN libraries is under study. The result may be a 2001 LSTA application. Wallace and Osburn libraries have shown interest in joining a network.

**Library Materials Expedited (LME):** ISL obtained a verbal quote from LME for creating a seven-library backbone for document deliver system across the state. The estimate was \$40,000. The State Library will ask for an appropriation for SFY2002 (available July 1, 2001). It was noted that LME's prices have been affected by price increases by Pony Express. This also affects an LSTA grant between the three libraries of the Eastern Idaho Library System to study courier services between Pocatello, Idaho Falls, and Rexburg.

### **June 7, 2000**

Report of the LiLI – Z Committee

Full report of the committee meeting is available at <http://www.lili.org/NAB/NAB-Zcommitteereport.htm>

A prototype of the Z39.50 gateway is available at <http://www.lili.org/servlet/Idaho>.

The LiLI-Z committee is considering a phased implementation of the gateway. The gateway may be unveiled at ILA in Oct. The committee may wish to do a presentation or exhibit table at the conference.

Regarding levels of participation, everyone should be able to see & use gateway services. There may be restrictions however on using ILL and copying records.

The Committee will ask the Information Technology Task Force (ITTF) to develop standards for participation, i.e., for showing their holdings.

Desirable Z39.50 services or facilities include the ability to sort results, show shelf status, and show in a results list which library in a consortium owns the book.

The Committee will ask ITTF needs to work on developing profile for Z39.50 servers and clients. The will examine both the Texas and Bath profiles.

The purpose of the Z39.50 gateway is to: 1) Support resource sharing including ILL; 2) Access high quality cataloging records; 3) serve as a portal to various kinds of information such as GILS, GIS, and other databases; and 4) provide a uniform interface – one consistent way of searching.

At this time, it is important to distinguish between LiLI-D and LiLI-Z on the LiLI web site. LiLI-D provides content; LiLI-Z provides information about collections.

The Committee will solicit participation by libraries. Selling points to the Idaho library community include catalogs to be searched through a single interface, cost for inclusion, and the benefits including ILL.

An unanswered question is do we want to make all Idaho library catalogs Z39.50 searchable or do we want libraries to share automation systems that would be Z39.50 searchable? It was noted that adding more libraries to be searched does not affect the capability of the gateway.

The issue of showing holdings and shelf status has not been resolved.

No Idaho Z39.50 servers currently match existing profiles.

A small number of library collections represent 80% of holding of Idaho public and academic libraries.

There is an LSTA grant in Eastern Idaho to connect eight libraries with Winnebago Z39.50 servers to eight or nine libraries that have Follett Z39.50 servers. EITech provides technical support. The Montana networking plan calls for server farms to be placed around the state.

State Library need benchmarks to determine how we will know that the Z39.50 gateway has been successful. Also needed is a simple, clear package to present to legislators.

There are a limited number of libraries participating in the testing and development phase; others can be added. There are no schools now participating in the testing of the gateway.

Goal: 85% of collections available through the gateway. We need more data to know what is possible.

Committee/ITTF needs to decide how the gateway will support ILL. Minimum performance must be reached before releasing it to the general public. If the gateway is not functional by ILA, it should not be presented.

#### Next step (ASAP)

Define what we want Z39.50 to do? Develop an Idaho profile for clients and servers: “The Idaho Way.” Facilitate participation in building the gateway between ITTF & public service personnel.

### Task list

Profile development/adoption

Identify a few local systems & work w/ them to apply profile

### ILL – NAB Committee

Models for walk-in recipient borrowing patron

Patron needs photo-id plus library card

Presents library card or identification or state library card

Lending library loans

Overdues are sent to patron cc to home library

Home library puts block on patron record

Patron can return book to home library or any library

Receiving library returns to home library by walk-in, mail, and courier

Bills sent to patron & home library

Payment made to network (\$ pool)

Network passed to lending library (self-insurance pool)

Lending library notifies home library to remove block

Home library will do what it can to get item back

### Big Questions

How to identify a legitimate patron?

Idaho library card or identification

Does patron have to make arrangements first? (How spontaneous)

Must at least have library card

Charge fees? No

Unserved population

ISL lead discussion for minimum card fee (a little above average tax paid in library taxing district)

Divided between closest library & network

Who is responsible for non-returned materials?

Home library

Self-insurance pool

Database of deadbeats

Collection agency

How to do overdues?

Sent to patron; cc to home library

How to return materials?

Courier or mail

Deadbeat database – repeat offenders

Catch those who use libraries as book stores (even if they pay for the "lost/unreturned" books)

Need mechanism to remove "reformed" patrons from database

Legal questions

Possible to use drivers license database?  
How would the database interface w/ local systems?

Why by-pass statewide card?  
Affects spontaneity  
Keep it easy for patron  
What is easiest to administer?  
Statewide database of patrons

School library cards are photo id's used for other purposes  
Model does not address school library cards

Incentive to get libraries to participate  
Public good  
Self-interest: serves your patrons in other parts of state

Administrative details still need worked out

Deadbeat list need for egregious violators – not a privacy violation  
Need to check legality – A.G. opinion  
Are patron records protected from other libraries?

Amount or number of items to loan – local policy

Agreement would not supersede other contractual borrowing agreements

Statement of terms of participation would be drawn up

Does cost of administration detail outweigh benefit?

Need some type of patron database

Statewide library card (“passport”) could be mechanism for creating patron database, has marketing value

Z39.50 could eventually include patron data exchange

Need something we can do now  
Most (?) Idaho libraries already honor library cards from other libraries across Idaho or within region or consortium

Home library card could have statewide sticker (hard to find common barcode format)

State card could be primary w/ sticker for local library

Can we begin this program without patron database or deadbeat database?

Same as everyone joining reciprocal borrowing in Idaho

Have focus groups at ILA?

Need buy-in of library staff consortia partners

Refer model to ILL committee

What would it take to implement?

Substitute “passport” for “reciprocal borrowing”

How to identify which libraries are participating at time of transaction?

### After lunch discussion

Reciprocal Borrowing agreement

-Needs some tweaking

Change in wording to be consistent w/ model

Could be used as basic statewide agreement

### Proposal: - Agreed

1. Alert current subscribers
2. Kay & Max draft; share w/ ILL committee by email
3. Comments back
4. Conference call if needed
5. NAB consider at Sept. meeting
6. Present at ILA
7. Open to private libraries; don't specify school libraries for now

Change name of Board from “Network Advisory Board” to “LiLI Board”

☺ AGREED

Revise Draft Networking Plan

Email Board for comments

Out to Library community by end of June

### NEXT STEPS

Revise LiLI Plan

Committee follow-up

Next meeting: September 18 & 19 (tentative)

Evaluation of Meeting

Structure of meetings O.K.? Yes

Facility O.K.? Yes

Parking convenient? Yes